



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,830	03/26/2001	Sangita R. Sharma	42390P10455	7805

8791 7590 09/15/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2655

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,830

Applicant(s)

SHARMA ET AL.

Examiner

Huyen X. Vo

Art Unit

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,10-12,14,15,20-22,25-27,29,30 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4-5, 10-12, 14-15, 20-22, 25-27, 29-30, and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant has submitted an RCE, filed 6/30/2005, amending independent claims to include a limitation regarding adaptation of user-specific acoustic models, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the amended limitation. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. However, nowhere in the specification and/or drawings of the present application specifically indicates the step of adapting user-specific acoustic models. The specification only mentions "... the acoustic model adaptor 134 may adapt the client acoustic model 137 ..." (*paragraph [0033]*) and fails to specifically and clearly explain whether the "client acoustic model" trained in advanced by the current user of the system or by a group of other trainers. Even if the "client acoustic model" were trained in advanced by the current user of the system, the teaching of Farrell et al. (US 6519561) would have anticipated this limitation (*See claim rejection*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2655

3. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-12, 14-5, 20-22, 25-27, 29-30, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al. (US 6442519) in view of Farrell et al. (US 6519561).

4. Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 26, Kanevsky et al. disclose an apparatus, method, system, and computer-readable medium, comprising: a server to couple to a client device having speech recognition functionality (*figure 1, client devices 102-104 and server 106*); and an acoustic model adaptor locatable at the server to adapt an acoustic model specifically for a user of the client device (*col. 7, ln. 19 to col. 8, ln. 64*); and wherein, when there is a network connection between the client device and the server (*figure 1*), the server and client device together implement a single user speech recognition system in which digitized raw speech data of a user or extracted speech feature data of user is received by the server from the client device and the acoustic model adaptor adapts a user-specific acoustic model for the client device (*col. 7, lines 1-67*).

Kanevsky et al. fail to specifically disclose the step of adapting the user-specific acoustic model for the client device based solely on the digitized raw speech data of the user or the extracted speech feature data of the user and the server stores the adapted user-specific acoustic model for use only by the associated client device and user. However, Farrell et al. teach the step of adapting the user-specific acoustic model for the client device based solely on the digitized raw speech data of the user or the extracted speech feature data of the user and the server stores the adapted user-

Art Unit: 2655

specific acoustic model for use only by the associated client device and user (*col. 4, lines 8-25*).

Since Kanevsky et al. and Farrell et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Kanevsky et al. by incorporating the teaching of Farrell et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy for the user of the system.

5. Regarding claims 2, 12, 22, and 27, Kanevsky et al. further disclose that the client device is a mobile computing device (*PDA 104 in figure 1*).

6. Regarding claims 5, 15, and 30, Kanevsky et al. further disclose that the client device includes local memory to store extracted speech feature data (*col. 4, ln. 29-46, local acoustic model is represented by speech features*).

7. Regarding claims 10, 20, 25, and 35, Kanevsky et al. further disclose that the client device downloads and stores the user-specific adapted acoustic model (*col. 7, ln. 19-40*).

8. Regarding claims 4, 14, and 29, Kanevsky et al. inherently disclose that the client device includes local memory to store digitized raw speech data (*computing devices 102, 104, and 106 in figure 1 inherently include local physical memory and/or memory buffer for storing application programs and/or data*).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Murveit et al. (US 6766295) is considered pertinent to the claimed invention.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HXV

9/2/2005


W. R. YOUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER